P. F. 2 of 95

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1894-95

192 .

(L.R.)

File No. 115 of 9

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Major ~~Par~~t B for July 1895

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the Siauchogi of Kariken and other villages in Liunku
Lq.

Cld

D. D.

BSR

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 147 of 94-95

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent. s.
Sibaiya represented by Mr K. T. Narasimiengar		1 Ranganna 2 Lakshminarasappa by Mr D. Venkataramaiya

25.6.95

Decision.

The judgt. appealed against states that no possession of the ling could be given to the appellant and his Advocate was not able to urge that the ryots, who have been discharging the duties ever since the Settlement and the villages were constituted into two charges could now be disturbed. The Appt court gave the appellant all the relief which he could have given when he declared his title as one of the Hssedars. The Dep Commr's judgt. is confirmed and this appeal dismissed.

2 6.95

Despd No 147

To Abdul Rahman Saheb Esq
Khan Bahadur.
28.6.95

2

Submitted to the third Councillor

28/6/95 Able

Submitted to the Commissioner
Second Appeal in regular list
In time
Stamp sufficient

V.S. 20/4

admit. Post
before
more units
22/4/95

R. 115772 4

[illegible]
11/[illegible]
Posted
[illegible]
29/4

[Gen. Serial No. 32.]

189 5

No. 270

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. [illegible]

Taluk. [illegible]

District. Tinnevelly

Date of Appl. 12-4-95

Date of Receipt. 15-4-95

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures. 4

ABSTRACT.

4

No. 2710

6-8-95

15/4/95

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 2710 R
DATE 15-4-95

10 RUPEES

MYSORE COURT FEE

A.S. 14 of 94-95

Before the Government of Mysore
Revenue Appeal (Second) Case
No. of 1894-95.

Appellant

Sabha of Brahmasandra in the
Kora hobli of the Tumkur
Taluq. (Plaintiff.)

~~vs~~

Respondents.

1. Patel, son of [illegible]
Rangaiah. -

2. Lakshminarasaiah son of
Narasappa;
both residing in the said
village of Brahmasandra

The appellant abovenamed
most respectfully begs to prefer
this appeal against the decision
of the Deputy
Commissioner of

K

of

[illegible]

9—4—95

[illegible]

[illegible]

of Pánkheo in Revenue Appeal Case No 12 of 1894-95, on the following grounds, namely

I That though the Assist Commissioner observes in para 8 of his judgment that there is abundance of evidence to prove the fact that the plaintiff's father and also his grandfather, have enjoyed the Shaukkokee land in question at least to the degree of one half (1/2) share and they did, in which Consequence, receive tirni as well, yet, he erred in finding in para 11 of his judgment that the plaintiffs possessed at least 1/3rd share in the Shaukkokee land of all the [illegible] illacas in suit and that the plaintiff's name should be entered as such in the Register under the head of Kistadars.

R

of Mudinahalli and Brahmanagraharam, held by the 2nd Defendant.

4-1895
Bangalore
K. P. Narasimha Iyengar
Advocate, for Appellant

The Judgments and Decrees of the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner are hereby modified accordingly.

K. P. Narasimha Iyengar
4-1895. Advocate, for Appellant

II That the Deputy Commissioner rightly observed in his judgment that the Treasury Assistant Commissioner decided that the Appellant and the Respondents are both entitled to the office, they being Cousins. But he did not decide as to what defined share the plaintiff (Appellant) possess in the office of Shanbhogue of the same villages in suit.

III That the plaintiff is entitled to one half share in the office of Shanbhogue of all the villages in suit and he is entitled to have his name entered in the Register as (1/2) one half Hakdar.

IV That under the circumstances of this Case, the plaintiff is entitled at present at least for the recovery of possession of the office of Shanbhogue of the villages of

XC

Gen. Serial No. 31.] (3) 1894-95

10

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
15-867
21 MAY 1895
Pet: 653

From The Deputy Commr.
Tumkur District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore.

Posted to 25th June
Notices to issue
[illegible] 23/5

Notices prepared 27/5/95

L.R. 115 - 94-3

Dated 16th May 1895.
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. appeal petition
Records in a separate packet

General No. 990

His Official Memorandum No. Pet/1508 of the 22nd April 1895.

Submitting the entire record regarding the Shanbogi of Brahmasandra and other villages in the Tumkur Taluk as required in the above

P A [illegible]
20/5

No 990
Rec:

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District.
Dated 16th May 1895.

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore.

Sir,
As required in your Official Memorandum No. Pet 1538 of the 22nd April 1895, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire record in revenue Appeal No. 12 of 1894-95 on the file of this Court regarding the Shanbogi of Brahmasandra and other villages in the Tumkur Taluk.

2. The enclosures of the memorandum under reply are herewith returned.—

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner.

Pet
1538
9
೨೦೮೦೦೭೫

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

L. R. 115—94-2

The accompanying Petition No. 27/C dated 12.4.95 received at the Dewan's Office from [illegible] of Brahmasamudra [illegible] Taluk appealing against the Dy. Commr's decision in Rev. appeal no 12 of 189[illegible] regarding the [illegible] of Brahmasamudra [illegible] villages is forwarded, together with its Four enclosures, to the Dy. Commissioner [illegible] for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned

By Order,

BANGALORE, 22/4/1895 } for Chief Secretary

22/4

Progs: of the Govt. of Mysore. (2) 12

Read.

Petition registered No: 770 dated 12th April 1895 from Settia of Brahma Samudra Tumkur Taluk, appealing against the Dy. Commr's judgment in Rev. appealcase No: 12 of 1894-95 on the file of his court regarding the Shanbhogueship of Kadlur, and 6 other villages of the Tumkur Taluk.

L.R 115-96

2. The Records of the case received with letter No: 990 dated 16th May 1895 from the Dy. Commr: Tumkur District.

P. ~~~~~

Order thereon: - No. 157/P.72-95 d 5.7.95

The judgment appealed against states that no possession of the huk could be given to the appellant, and his advocate was not able to urge that the Respondents who have been discharging the

duties

9 (6)

14

ನಂಬರ್ 2710 / AS. 147

L.R. 115 — 94-5

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ

ತುಮಕೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಸಂದ್ರದ ಸಿದ್ದೈಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟು -

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಜಕೂರು ತರಿತೆರೆ ವಗ್ಗೆರೆಪಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ತಾನುಬಾಗಿತೆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 1894-95ನೇ ಇಸವಿ 12ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತುಮಕೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡಿಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಜಡ್ಜಮೆಂಟಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ 12-4-95ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನೂ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು-

ಡಿಪುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರವರ ಜಡ್ಜಮೆಂಟ್ ಖಾಯಂ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಅಪೀಲ್ ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮಲಕೂಫಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

ಬರಾ 1-7-95.

By Order

draft

Revenue Secre

ಶ್ರೀ

5

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನ ಕಡೆ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ ವೆಂಗಕೆ-ಅ-ನರಸಿಂಹೈಯಂಗಾರ್ರಿಗೆ.

From

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

13

duties ever since the Potgi settlement and the villages were constituted into two charges could now be disturbed. The Assistant Commr: gave the ~~appointment~~ appellant all the relief which he could have given when he declared his title as one of the Hissedars. The Dy. Commr's judgment is confirmed and this appeal is dismissed. ~~The records are returned.~~

5-7-95

Draft

Commissioner Rev: Secy.

8/7

To The Dy. Commr
[illegible] Dt
+ with the records of the case

Sent 8/7

+ sent by parcel
8/7